

REMARKS

Applicants gratefully appreciate the courtesies extended by Examiner Sharon and Examiner Ferris to Applicants' representative Mr. Brown during the October 7, 2004 personal interview conducted at the United States Patent and Trademark Office. The following Statement of the Substance of the Interview is being respectfully submitted within a month of the Interview, and therefore is believed to be timely filed.

During the Examiner interview, Applicants' representative submitted that the applied reference of Carlson does not disclose the claimed features of independent claims 1 and 19 concerning *synthesizing with generation timings of the noise waveforms taken into consideration the signal waveform and the noise waveforms calculated for each of the plurality of kinds of to obtain a noise composite waveform which is the signal waveform on which the noise is superposed; and performing noise checking based on the noise composite waveform*

wherein when the noise checking is performed, a maximum delay time and a minimum delay time of the noticed wiring line are extracted from the noise composite waveform, and overdelay/racing checking for the noticed wiring line is performed using the maximum delay time and the minimum delay time.

For example, the noise waveform synthesis section 16 synthesizes the noise waveforms and the transmission line waveform (signal waveform) shown in ① of Fig. 10B to obtain a noise composite waveform shown in ④ of Fig. 10B.

In contrast, Carlson fails to disclose obtaining a noise composite waveform which is the signal waveform on which the noise is superposed. That is, the Examiner has repeatedly failed to point out explicitly the disclosure of Carlson regarding the claimed feature of obtaining a noise composite waveform which is the signal waveform on which the noise is superposed. Instead, the Examiner merely reiterates the claim language at issue and broadly asserts that Carlson discloses in col. 3, line 52 to col. 5, line 34.

Moreover, since Carlson is silent with regard to obtaining a noise composite waveform, as discussed above, it follows that Carlson also fails to disclose the features of the claimed invention concerning *wherein when the noise checking is performed, a maximum delay time and a minimum delay time of the noticed wiring line are extracted from the noise composite waveform, and overdelay/racing checking for the noticed.*

For example, such a noise composite waveform as shown in Fig. 11 is calculated, then the noise checking section 18 extracts a maximum delay time T_{dmax} and a minimum delay time T_{dmin} of the noticed net from the noise composite waveform. The, the noise checking section 18 performs an overdelay/racing checks of the noticed net using the maximum delay time T_{dmax} and

the minimum delay time T_{dmin} of the noticed net calculated in such a manner as just described example shown in Fig. 12.

More importantly, it is respectfully submitted that during the October 7, 2004 interview, the Examiners agreed "with Applicant's representative that the Carlson reference does not teach the claimed limitation regarding the composite noise signal ... [and that] the Carlson reference will be withdrawn and a new search will be conducted." Please see the corresponding Interview Summary Record dated October 14, 2004.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the rejections based on at least Carlson with regard to claims 1-32 be withdrawn immediately, and that the claims are in condition for allowance. Applicants request such action at an early date.

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.



Attorney Docket No. 001399
U.S. Serial No. 09/708,470

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully Submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP

Thomas E. Brown
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 44,450

TEB/jl
Atty. Docket No. 001399
Suite 700,
1250 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 822-1100

38834
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE